

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/518,624	09/518,624 03/03/2000		Donald B. Peddicord	11162/2001	5802	
24349	7590	09/25/2003				
WILLIAM		TAVSON .	EXAMINER			
SUITE 118: 9330 LBJ F	RWY.			THORNTON, KRISANNE MARIE		
DALLAS, 7	ΓX 75243	·		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	-			1744		
				DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	q	Application No		Applicant(s)			
		09/518,624		PEDDICORD ET AL.			
. ∴ Office	Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit			
		Krisanne M. The	prnton	1744			
Period for Reply	ING DATE of this communication app						
THE MAILING D - Extensions of time mafter SIX (6) MONTH - If the period for reply - If NO period for reply - Failure to reply within - Any reply received by	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. The provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 (S) from the mailing date of this communication. Specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replication is specified above, the maximum statutory period in the set or extended period for reply will, by statute to the Office later than three months after the mailing djustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, how y within the statutory m will apply and will expire	ever, may a reply be tim nimum of thirty (30) days SIX (6) MONTHS from	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.			
1)☐ Responsi	ve to communication(s) filed on	·					
2a)☐ This actio	n is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	nis action is non-1	inal.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1</u>	-18 is/are pending in the application	۱.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) _	is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1</u> -	<u>-18</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) _	is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) _	are subject to restriction and/o	r election require	ment.				
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specific	cation is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing	g(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep	oted or b)⊡ objec	ed to by the Exan	niner.			
	may not request that any objection to the			• •			
11)☐ The propose	ed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)∏ approv	ed b)⊡ disapprov	ved by the Examiner.			
	d, corrected drawings are required in rep	•	tion.				
12)∐ The oath or	declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.					
Priority under 35 U.	S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowled	gment is made of a claim for foreigr	priority under 3	5 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1.☐ Certi	fied copies of the priority documents	s have been rece	eived.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
	ment is made of a claim for domesti		•				
a) 🗌 The tra	nslation of the foreign language pro ment is made of a claim for domesti	visional applicati	on has been rece	eived.			
Attachment(s)		,,					
3) Niformation Disclosu	s Cited (PTO-892) on's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) are Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u>	4)		(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)			
P.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 04-01)	Office Ac	tion Summary	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Part of Paper No. 4			

Application/Control Number: 09/518,624

Art Unit: 1744

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peddicord et al., U.S. patent No. 6,589,491 or Peddicord U.S. patent No. 6,183,704 in

Application/Control Number: 09/518,624

Art Unit: 1744

view of either of Fentiman U.S. patent No. 2,895,753 or Glickman U.S. patent No. 5,061,219.

Both Peddicord patents teach a salt platform having a support structure configured with a hub and radial braces, some disclosed as curved and which are engaged by frictional fit.

Both Fentiman and Glickman teach joined building structures which are configured with locking elements for cooperative, sustained engagement. Each teach the use of a slot/key type configuration with the slot means being found on the periphery of a hub means and having keyed radial means, with the keys being substantially T-shaped. It is taught that such configurations provided optimized structural stability and connection.

It would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the frictional engagement structure of either of the Peddicord systems with the keyed locking elements system of either of Fentiman or Glickman, because the use of such locking systems would provide optimized structural stability and connection.

With respect to claim 10, while the specific angle is not recited within either Fentiman or Glickman, such a configuration is clearly taught and the angle obviously chosen for the given application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krisanne M. Thornton whose telephone number is 703-308-3914. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Wed. 6:30am-4:00pm.

Art Unit: 1744

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert J. Warden can be reached on 703-308-2920. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

KRISANNE THORNTON PRIMARY EXAMINER

September 22, 2003